UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/549,743	09/19/2005	Craig N Schubert	62212A	3393
The Dow Chem	7590 04/12/201 iical Company	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 1967 Midland, MI 48		WU, IVES J		
minialiu, mii 40	0+1		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/12/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/549,743	SCHUBERT, CRAIG N		
Examiner	Art Unit		
I IVES WU	l 1797		

	IVES WU	1797	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>07 April 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of the service of the s	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth inter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ). On which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply original.	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII  36(a) and the appropriate of the fee. The appropriate analy set in the final Office	e extension fee ate extension; or (2) as
set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	than three months after the mailing date	e of the final rejection, e	ven if timely filed,
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wind AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); er form for appeal by materially rec	E below); ducing or simplifying th	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a converge NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			DTOL 204)
<ul> <li>4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>5. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all</li> </ul>	See Continuation Sheet.		,
non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). ( 13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Duane Smith/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1797			

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Process claims 20,26-30 under 103 rejection in view of Wagner et al (US 6852144B1); Bedell (US 5167941A), Landeck et al (US 5413627A).

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The 112 1st and 2nd rejections of claims 19,23-25,30 are sustained because the argument of roundup is lack of basis, furthermore, in view of the data of lean water content in Tables of Specification- 4,4.1,4.3 in such small difference.

Arguments regarding the water content less than 9% by wt in chemical and physical solvent composition claimed by Applicant while prior art Landeck et al (US 5413627A) only teach the small water contents for physical scrubbing solvent base. However, the piperazine is well known as a promoter or activator used in combination with physical/chemical solvents, therefore, the solvent composition in the instant claim is not considered as physical and chemical solvents combination. Prior art Mak (US 20060110300A1) teaches that solvents including enhanced tertiary amine (e.g., piperazine) having similar behavior as physical solvent ([0047]). Therefore, the combined teaching with prior art Landeck et al (US 5413627A) is applicable.

Arguments regarding the "selective removal of COS from a gas stream", prior art Wagner et al (US 6852144B1) teach method for removing COS from a stream (Title), therefore, it reads on the limitations of "selective removal COS from a gas stream", although the results of data for evidence of selection is differently presented by Wagner et al (US 6852144B1) and by Applicants